

Anomalous Frequency Shift in Photoassociation of a Bose-Einstein Condensate

Matt Mackie

Helsinki Institute of Physics, PL 64, FIN-00014 Helsingin yliopisto, Finland
(February 2, 2008)

We theoretically investigate the effect of anomalous quantum correlations on the light-induced frequency shift in the photoassociation spectrum of a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC). Anomalous quantum correlations arise because, although formed from a pair of zero-momentum condensate atoms, a condensate molecule need not dissociate back to the BEC, but may just as well form a noncondensate atom pair with equal and opposite momentum, i.e., due to rogue photodissociation. The uncorrelated frequency shift of the photoassociation spectrum is to the red and linearly dependent on the laser intensity I . In contrast, anomalous correlations due to rogue dissociation lead to a blueshifted photoassociation spectrum. For sufficiently low light intensities, the rogue blueshift is dominant and proportional to $\sqrt{I}$.

PACS number(s): 03.75.Nt, 03.75.Mn, 05.30.Jp

Photoassociation occurs when two free atoms absorb a laser photon, thereby jumping from the two-atom continuum to a bound molecular state [1]. If the atoms form a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC), then the molecules will too [2–5]. While evidence for the photoassociative formation of quantum degenerate molecules has yet to emerge, the quest has led to the observation [6] of strongly enhanced molecule formation [7–9], precise measurements [10–12] of the light-induced shift of the photoassociation spectrum [8,13,14], and tests [11,12] of a fundamental (non-unitary) limit to the atom-molecule conversion rate [2,15,16].

In coherent photoassociation, the initial atoms belong to a Bose-Einstein condensate, and therefore so will the molecules. However, transitions to the continuum of noncondensate atomic modes can occur because photodissociation of a zero-momentum ($\mathbf{k} = 0$) condensate molecule need not take the atoms back to the $\mathbf{k} = 0$ atomic condensate, but may just as well end up with two atoms with opposite momenta ($\pm\mathbf{k}$), i.e., due to rogue [2,15,16] or unwanted [17,18] photodissociation. Rogue dissociation to noncondensate modes ultimately leads to anomalous quantum correlations, which are the bosonic equivalent of the Cooper pairs responsible for superconductivity. An immediate consequence of said pairing is the above-mentioned non-unitary limit on the rate of conversion from an atomic to a molecular condensate [2,15,16]; additionally, there is the possibility of creating strongly-correlated twin atomic beams [19].

The purpose of this Letter is to reveal the effect of anomalous quantum correlations on the light-induced shift of the photoassociation spectrum of a Bose-Einstein condensate. Uncorrelated free-bound couplings necessarily introduce a redshift to the photoassociation spectrum which, to lowest nontrivial order, is linear in laser intensity [8,10–14]. In contrast, we find that anomalous correlations lead to a blueshifted photoassociation spectrum. To lowest nontrivial order, the rogue frequency shift is dominant and proportional to the squareroot of the photoassociation laser intensity.

Our description starts with a plane-wave laser field with photon momentum $\mathbf{q}$ to drive photoassociation and photodissociation. Initially there is only a condensate of N zero-momentum atoms present, and these are characterized by the boson operator $a \equiv a_0$. By momentum conservation, only molecules with momentum $\mathbf{q}$ will be generated in the primary photoassociation process, and these are characterized by the boson operator $b \equiv b_{\mathbf{q}}$. Upon photodissociation, the molecules break up into pairs of atoms with equal and opposite momenta, and these atoms are characterized by the boson operators $a_{\pm\mathbf{k}}$. The Hamiltonian for this system is given by

$$\hbar^{-1}H = \delta b^\dagger b + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{k}} + \frac{\Omega}{\sqrt{N}} (b^\dagger a a + a^\dagger a^\dagger b), \\ + \frac{\Omega}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} f(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) \left[b^\dagger a_{\mathbf{k}} a_{-\mathbf{k}} + a_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger b \right]. \quad (1)$$

Here the quantity δ is the detuning of the laser above the photodissociation threshold of the molecules, which is corrected for photon recoil effects [2,15], and which is a measure of the molecular binding energy. The atom-molecule Rabi coupling Ω is given by the expression

$$\Omega = \lim_{\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{2} \pi \hbar^{3/2} n}{\mu^{3/2}} \frac{\Gamma_0(\epsilon_k)}{\sqrt{\epsilon_k}}}, \quad (2)$$

where $n = n_A + 2n_M$ is an invariant condensate density, derived from the densities of atoms and molecules, $\mu = m/2$ is the reduced mass of an atom pair, and Γ_0 is the rate of photodissociation to an atom pair of energy $\hbar\epsilon_k = \hbar^2 k^2 / 2\mu$. In order for Eq. (2) to give a finite atom-molecule coupling, for low energies $\Gamma_0 \propto \sqrt{\epsilon_k}$ must hold true, which is just another way of stating the Wigner threshold law [1]. Lastly, the coupling of the molecular condensate mode to noncondensate atomic modes is $\Omega f(\epsilon_k) / \sqrt{N}$, which is a measure of the coupling strength for photodissociation of a molecule to an atom pair of energy $\hbar\epsilon_k$, with $f(\epsilon_k)$ describing the energy (wavenumber) dependence of the coupling.

Next we describe rogue dissociation in the language of system-reservoir interactions [20]. The intracondensate coupling term is neglected, since it is not necessary to the main point, and since it can be re-introduced later anyway [20]. The focus is now on a molecular condensate coupled to a bath of dissociated atom pairs. Switching to the interaction picture, the system-reservoir Hamiltonian is

$$\hbar^{-1} H_I(t) = b^\dagger \Gamma(t) e^{i\delta t} + \Gamma^\dagger(t) b e^{-i\delta t} \quad (3)$$

with the reservoir operator $\Gamma(t)$ defined as

$$\Gamma(t) = \frac{\Omega}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} f(\epsilon_k) a_{\mathbf{k}} a_{-\mathbf{k}} e^{-i\epsilon_k t}. \quad (4)$$

The equation of motion for the total density matrix is then $\dot{\rho}_T = -i\hbar^{-1}[H_I(t), \rho_T(t)]$. The reduced density matrix for the system is obtained by integrating out (tracing over) the reservoir degrees of freedom: $\rho(t) = \text{Tr}\{\rho_T(t)\}_R = \langle \rho_T(t) \rangle_R$. It is assumed that, initially, there are no correlations between the system and reservoir: $\rho(0) = \langle \rho_T(0) \rangle_R = \langle \rho(0) \otimes \rho_R \rangle_R$. The so-called master equation is then the equation of motion for the reduced density matrix. To second order in perturbation theory, the master equation for rogue dissociation is

$$\dot{\rho}(t) = U(t)\rho(t), \quad (5)$$

with the generator of time evolution given as

$$\begin{aligned} U(t) = & -\frac{i}{\hbar} \langle [H_I(t), \rho_R \otimes (\cdot)] \rangle_R \\ & + \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^t dt' \langle [H_I(t'), \rho_R \otimes \langle [H_I(t'), \rho_R \otimes (\cdot)] \rangle_R] \rangle_R \\ & - \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^t dt' \langle [H_I(t), [H_I(t'), \rho_R \otimes (\cdot)]] \rangle_R. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The departure from a textbook treatment [20] lies in the rogue dissociation paradigm $\langle \Gamma(t) \rangle \neq 0$, meaning that $\langle [H_I(t), \rho_R \otimes \rho] \rangle_R$ is nonvanishing and first order terms are *not absent* from the master equation (5) for the reduced density matrix. For small couplings, only terms $\propto \langle \Gamma(t) \rangle_R$ will contribute, and the generator of time evolution simplifies to

$$U(t) = \mathcal{I}[b^\dagger, (\cdot)] - \mathcal{I}^*[b, (\cdot)], \quad (7a)$$

$$\mathcal{I} = -i \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t dt' \langle \Gamma(t') \rangle_R e^{i\delta t'}. \quad (7b)$$

The quantum-correlated shift of the molecular binding energy is buried in the integral $\mathcal{I}$, and we now proceed with its extraction. Substitution of Eq. (4) yields

$$\mathcal{I} = -i \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t dt' \frac{\Omega}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} f(k) \langle a_{\mathbf{k}} a_{-\mathbf{k}} \rangle_R e^{i(\epsilon_k - \delta)t'}. \quad (8)$$

The summation of momentum states is converted to an integral over frequency according to [21]

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} G(k) \rightarrow \frac{1}{4\pi^2 \omega_r^{3/2}} \int_0^\infty d\epsilon \sqrt{\epsilon} G(\epsilon), \quad (9)$$

where $\omega_r = \hbar n^{2/3}/2\mu$ is our usual density-dependent frequency parameter [2,15,16]. Next we recall that $f(\epsilon)$ contains the wavenumber dependence of the system-reservoir coupling, and choose a Wigner threshold coupling, $f(\epsilon) = 1$, for all energies. Also, as was implicit to Ref. [16], the rogue pair correlation function is written $C(\epsilon) = \langle a_{\mathbf{k}} a_{-\mathbf{k}} \rangle \sqrt[4]{\epsilon} / (2\sqrt{\pi} \omega_r^{3/4})$, which has units of (frequency) $^{-1/2}$. Lastly, the system-reservoir Rabi coupling is redefined as $\xi = \Omega / (2\sqrt{\pi} \omega_r^{3/4})$, which is related to the on-shell photodissociation rate $\Gamma_0 = \xi^2 \sqrt{\delta}$.

For $\delta = |\delta| \sim \epsilon_b$, with the molecular binding energy ϵ_b taken as the largest frequency in the problem, the integral $\mathcal{I}$ then becomes

$$\mathcal{I} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{N \Gamma_0} \dot{\varphi}(\epsilon_b) |C(\epsilon_b)| - i \Delta \epsilon_b, \quad (10a)$$

$$\Delta \epsilon_b = \frac{\sqrt{N} \xi}{2\pi} \text{P} \int_{-\infty}^\infty d\epsilon \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sqrt[4]{\epsilon + \epsilon_b} \dot{\varphi}(\epsilon + \epsilon_b) |C(\epsilon + \epsilon_b)|, \quad (10b)$$

where P denotes the Cauchy principle value and we have assumed $C(\epsilon; t) = |C(\epsilon)| \exp[-i\varphi(\epsilon; t)/2]$ with $\dot{\varphi} \approx 0$. The sought-after shift appears explicitly from time evolution of the mean-field MBEC amplitude $\dot{\beta} = \langle b \dot{\rho} \rangle = -\mathcal{I}^* \beta$, which has a Schrödinger-picture solution

$$\beta(t) = \beta(0) e^{-i(\epsilon_b + \Delta \epsilon_b)t} e^{-\gamma t/2}, \quad (11)$$

with $\gamma = \sqrt{N \Gamma_0} \dot{\varphi}(\epsilon_b) |C(\epsilon_b)|$. From the expression (11), the frequency shift due to rogue quantum correlations is clearly to the blue and it is proportional to $\sqrt{\Gamma_0} \propto \sqrt{I}$. Note the collective enhancement factor $\sqrt{N}$, which would play a role if the system were initially a Bose condensate of molecules, as opposed to a BEC of atoms.

For contrast, we briefly describe the uncorrelated redshift, borrowing the Ref. [10] account of the Bohn-Julienne theory [14]. This shift is a consequence of the light-induced coupling between the free-atom continuum and the discrete bound molecular state. Based on Fano theory [22], valid for any discrete level coupled to any continuum, the molecular binding energy is shifted by an amount

$$\hbar \Delta \epsilon_b^{(u)} \propto \int d\epsilon' \frac{D(\epsilon')}{(\epsilon - \epsilon')}, \quad (12)$$

where $D(\epsilon')$ is the density of continuum states at the energy $\hbar \epsilon'$. The integrand in Eq. (12) is of course positive (negative) for $\epsilon' < \epsilon$ ($\epsilon' > \epsilon$), and the density of states increases with increasing ϵ' . The negative part of the integrand therefore contributes more strongly, and the continuum shift $\Delta \epsilon_b$ is always to the red. This redshift is linearly proportional to the square of the free-bound coupling, and thus linearly proportional to intensity.

In order for the rogue blueshift to dominate the uncorrelated redshift (12), lowest-order perturbation theory must be valid. According to our previous work [15], the photon recoil frequency, $\epsilon_R = \hbar/2m\lambda^2$, is expected to set the scale for the coupling strength:

$$\frac{\Omega}{\epsilon_R} = \sqrt{n\lambda^3} \sqrt{\frac{I}{I_0}}, \quad (13)$$

where $2\pi\lambda$ is the wavelength of the photoassociation laser; also, $I_0 = v\lambda_D^3/(32\pi\lambda K)$ is the characteristic intensity of photoassociation to a given molecular level, with v the relative velocity of the colliding atoms, λ_D the de-Broglie wavelength (in terms of the reduced mass), and $\tilde{K} = dK/dI$ the photoassociation rate coefficient [23]. The rogue master equation (5) is thereby written in dimensionless form, and first order perturbation theory is expected to be valid for $\Omega/\epsilon_R \ll 1$, which translates into intensities satisfying $[(n\lambda^3)(I/I_0)]^{1/2} \ll 1$.

In photoassociation of an atomic BEC, i.e., absent a macroscopic number of molecules, the size of the rogue blueshift should be given roughly by $\Delta\epsilon_b \sim \gamma/\sqrt{N} \sim \Omega\epsilon_b^{1/2}/4\pi\omega_r^{3/2}$, where we have taken $\dot{\varphi} \sim \epsilon_R$ and $|C| \sim \sqrt[4]{\epsilon_b}/(2\sqrt{\pi}\omega_r^{3/4})$. Inserting Eq. (13), the magnitude of the blueshift becomes

$$\frac{\Delta\epsilon_b}{\epsilon_R} \sim \frac{1}{4\pi} \sqrt{n\lambda^3} \sqrt{\frac{I}{I_0}} \frac{\epsilon_b\epsilon_R^2}{\omega_r^3}. \quad (14)$$

To make the density dependence explicit, we write the shift in terms of the photodissociation rate, $\Delta\epsilon_b \sim \Gamma_0/[(n\lambda^3)(I/I_0)]^{1/2}$. Besides being proportional to $\sqrt{I}$, the magnitude of the shift is proportional to $1/\sqrt{n}$, so that smaller condensates will give larger blueshifts.

Note that second-order perturbation theory is required when $\Omega/\epsilon_r \sim 1$, which is the regime of experiments performed so far [10–12]. In this case, terms such as $\langle\Gamma\rangle^2$ and $\langle\Gamma\Gamma\rangle$ will contribute blueshifts as well. These terms will add to the usual uncorrelated redshift (12), which arises here from terms like $\langle\Gamma^\dagger\Gamma\rangle$. A quantitative analysis of the higher-order contributions to the frequency shift is given elsewhere [24].

In conclusion, low-intensity rogue photodissociation should result in a blueshift of the molecular binding energy, proportional to $\sqrt{I}$, that dominates the usual redshift. The magnitude of this blueshift is proportional to $1/\sqrt{n}$, so that smaller condensates will yield more significant shifts. If the systems starts out as a molecular Bose-Einstein condensate, then the frequency shift, correlated or not, should reveal the effects of collective enhancement. Realizing that the anomalous pair correlations herein are the bosonic equivalent of Cooper pairs provides an intuitive understanding of the rogue blueshift: analogous to the superfluid gap, there is a finite amount of energy required to form (break) a correlated pair, leading to an increase in the amount of energy required to excite the system, in the present case, to destroy (create) a molecule. With this idea in mind, the

rogue blueshift could serve as a signature for the presence of Cooper pairing in a Fermi degenerate gas [24].

The author acknowledges Jyrki Piilo and Kalle-Antti Suominen for helpful discussions, as well the Academy of Finland for support (project 50314).

-
- [1] J. Weiner, V. S. Bagnato, S. Zilio, and P. S. Julienne, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **71**, 1 (1999).
 - [2] J. Javanainen and M. Mackie, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, R3186 (1999).
 - [3] D. J. Heinzen, R. Wynar, P. D. Drummond, and K. V. Kheruntsyan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 5029 (2000).
 - [4] J. J. Hope and M. K. Olsen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3220 (2001).
 - [5] A. Vardi, V. A. Yurovsky, and J. R. Anglin, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 063611 (2001).
 - [6] R. Wynar, R. S. Freeland, D. J. Han, C. Ryu, and D. J. Heinzen, *Science* **287**, 1016 (2000).
 - [7] K. Burnett, P. S. Julienne, and K.-A. Suominen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 1416 (1997).
 - [8] J. Javanainen and M. Mackie, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, R789 (1998).
 - [9] P. S. Julienne, K. Burnett, Y. B. Band, and W. C. Stwalley, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, R797 (1998).
 - [10] J. M. Gerton, B. J. Frew, and R. G. Hulet, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 053410 (2001).
 - [11] C. McKenzie *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 120403 (2002).
 - [12] I. D. Prodan, M. Pichler, M. Junker, R. G. Hulet, and J. L. Bohn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* (in press).
 - [13] P. O. Fedichev, Yu. Kagan, G. V. Shlyapnikov, and J. T. M. Walraven, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 2913 (1996).
 - [14] J. L. Bohn and P. S. Julienne, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 414 (1999).
 - [15] M. Kořtrun, M. Mackie, R. Côté, and J. Javanainen, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 063616 (2000).
 - [16] J. Javanainen and M. Mackie, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 090403 (2002).
 - [17] K. Goral, M. Gajda, and K. Rzażewski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 1397 (2001).
 - [18] M. Holland, J. Park, and R. Walser, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 1915 (2001).
 - [19] K. V. Kheruntsyan and P. D. Drummond, *Phys. Rev. A* **66** 031602 (R) (2002).
 - [20] D. F. Walls and G. J. Milburn, *Quantum Optics* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994).
 - [21] The exclusion of the $\mathbf{k} = 0$ modes from the summation is inconsequential [16].
 - [22] U. Fano, *Phys. Rev.* **124**, 1866 (1961).
 - [23] The definition of the photoassociation rate coefficient, $\tilde{K} = dK/dI$, is based on the standard two-body rate equation $\dot{n} = -Kn^2$.
 - [24] M. Mackie, (unpublished).